

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 484

October 10, 1995, 6:44 p.m.
Page S-14876 Temp. Record

JOB PROGRAMS REFORM/Displaced Homemaker Mandate

SUBJECT: Workforce Development Act of 1995 . . . S. 143. Glenn amendment No. 2889 to the Kassebaum substitute amendment No. 2885.

ACTION: AMENDMENT REJECTED, 44-53

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 143, the Workforce Development Act of 1995, will replace more than 80 Federal workforce employment and workforce education programs with a single program. That program will provide 93 percent of the authorized funds to the States in grants with minimal Federal requirements.

The Kassebaum substitute amendment would make changes agreed to by the bill managers.

The Glenn amendment would expand the definition of displaced homemakers, would add programs to serve displaced homemakers to the list of permissible workforce training programs, and would require States to develop workforce education programs for displaced homemakers. States would set benchmarks for those education programs, and would report annually on whether they reached their benchmarks. (The term "displaced homemakers" has generally applied to women who, after having been full-time homemakers for a substantial number of years, have been recently widowed or divorced or have recently lost public assistance and consequently need to find employment.)

Those favoring the amendment contended:

This bill specifically references some particularly vulnerable groups, like the handicapped, but it does not reference displaced homemakers. The Glenn amendment would fix this problem. There are 37 million displaced homemakers in the United States. These are mainly women who have been full-time homemakers, but, due to divorce or the death of their husbands, or to the loss of public assistance benefits, they must now enter the workforce. Currently, these women are provided help under the Perkins displaced homemakers program, but that program will be eliminated by this bill. We think States need to be encouraged to set up programs to replace the Perkins program, because it has had amazing success. Approximately 80 percent of the women served have ended up

(See other side)

YEAS (44)			NAYS (53)			NOT VOTING (2)	
Republicans (1 or 2%)	Democrats (43 or 96%)		Republicans (51 or 98%)	Democrats (2 or 4%)		Republicans (1)	Democrats (1)
Snowe	Akaka	Inouye	Abraham	Helms	Heflin	Cohen- ⁴	Exon- ²
	Baucus	Johnston	Ashcroft	Hutchison	Kerrey		
	Biden	Kennedy	Bennett	Inhofe			
	Bingaman	Kerry	Bond	Jeffords			
	Boxer	Kohl	Brown	Kassebaum			
	Bradley	Lautenberg	Burns	Kempthorne			
	Breaux	Leahy	Campbell	Kyl			
	Bryan	Levin	Chafee	Lott			
	Bumpers	Lieberman	Coats	Lugar			
	Byrd	Mikulski	Cochran	Mack			
	Conrad	Moseley-Braun	Coverdell	McCain			
	Daschle	Moynihan	Craig	McConnell			
	Dodd	Murray	D'Amato	Murkowski			
	Dorgan	Nunn	DeWine	Nickles			
	Feingold	Pell	Dole	Pressler			
	Feinstein	Pryor	Domenici	Roth			
	Ford	Reid	Faircloth	Santorum			
	Glenn	Robb	Frist	Shelby			
	Graham	Rockefeller	Gorton	Simpson			
	Harkin	Sarbanes	Gramm	Smith			
	Hollings	Simon	Grams	Specter			
		Wellstone	Grassley	Stevens			
			Gregg	Thomas			
			Hatch	Thompson			
			Hatfield	Thurmond			
				Warner			
						EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:	
						1—Official Business	
						2—Necessarily Absent	
						3—Illness	
						4—Other	
						SYMBOLS:	
						AY—Announced Yea	
						AN—Announced Nay	
						PY—Paired Yea	
						PN—Paired Nay	

in employment or in post-secondary education. Further, 85 percent of the women who have gone through the program have rated it highly. The Glenn amendment would not impose an undue burden on the States. All it would make them do is set up these programs; they would not have to fund them generously. The point of the amendment is to make certain that States fully consider the needs of displaced homemakers. We urge Senators to view the amendment in that light, and to vote for its adoption.

Those opposing the amendment contended:

We favor educating and providing job training for displaced homemakers, but we cannot support this amendment. First, it would expand the definition of the term "displaced homemaker" from its traditional meaning of a person, almost always a woman, who has lost her means of financial support and must find employment after being a full-time homemaker for a substantial number of years. If we are going to serve this population, we should not dilute what it means to be a member of this population in order to make it easy for almost anyone to qualify. Second, and more importantly, this amendment would require, not merely permit, States to provide displaced homemaker assistance. The workforce training language in the amendment is merely duplicative of language already in the bill, but the language in the amendment on workforce education is binding. We are not relieved by the fact that specific spending amounts are not detailed; it is still the type of detailed Federal mandate we are trying to avoid in this bill. This bill already clearly will allow States to provide special programs for displaced homemakers, because it includes those homemakers under its definition of "dislocated workers," and it requires States to take special steps to help dislocated workers. We do not believe it is advisable to add an even more detailed mandate. We therefore urge our colleagues to reject the Glenn amendment.